

**OLDER ADULT PERFORMANCE OUTCOME PILOT
COMMITTEE MEETING SYNOPSIS
April 13, 2000**

Jim Higgins, Department of Mental Health (DMH), led introductions and reviewed the agenda (Attachment 1). Representatives from the following counties were present: Astrid Beigel (Los Angeles County), Mary Flett (Santa Clara County), Carmen Stitt and Victor Contreras (Sacramento County), Sharon Lopez (Shasta County), and Luanna Smith (Tuolumne County). Chester Cochran represented consumers; Jane Laciste represented the DMH Older Adult Specialized Programs Unit (replacing Marita McElvain); and Jim Higgins, Karen Purvis, and Traci Fujita represented the DMH Research and Performance Outcome Development Unit.

The following agenda items were discussed:

- County Reports. Pilot county representatives each provided a brief status report on their county's progress. Sacramento and Tuolumne counties distributed handouts describing some of their pilot experiences (Attachment 2). Committee members discussed various problems they had noted (e.g., the considerable time needed to complete the instruments - especially the face sheet, the accuracy of the time estimates made by clinicians, and difficulties they experienced in collecting second administration data).
- Clinician-administered Instruments. Carmen Stitt presented several tables summarizing preliminary pilot results of the Kennedy Axis V (see Attachment 3). Mary Flett presented initial reliability/validity results of the Santa Clara Functional Assessment Scale (FAS), as well as a copy of the instrument (see Attachment 4). She will provide additional information about the FAS to other counties interested in piloting it.
- Instrument Completion Problems. Traci Fujita distributed a revised version of the data dictionary and listed a few of the continuing problems she had noted in the older adult data, particularly second administration demographic results which are not consistent with first administration data for information which should not change, such as sex or race. Jim Higgins noted that these questions would not be asked more than one time once the older adult system is formally implemented.
- Service Trajectory. Jim Higgins presented tables showing the dropoff in service utilization for a cohort of 33,478 clients over the course of three years. The committee discussed the implications this has for instrument administration time frames for older adults.
- Pilot Report Qualitative Questions. Karen Purvis distributed an outline (Attachment 5) suggesting the types of qualitative data that could be included in the final report in addition to the quantitative instrument data. Since time was short, the committee decided to revisit this topic at the next meeting. In order to keep pilot data collection on track for completion by the end of the year, a cutoff of April 28th was set for administration 1 of the instruments.
- The next meeting of the Older Adult Performance Outcome Pilot committee was scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 2000.